

**REMARKS**

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 9, 14, 17 and 20-26 and 28-30 is acknowledged and appreciated. In order to expedite issuance of the present application, claims 9, 14, 17, 20, 23 and 25 have been rewritten into independent form. In view of the following remarks, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Albertsen. Solely in order to expedite prosecution, claims 1-8, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 27 have been canceled without prejudice/disclaimer to the subject matter embodied thereby, rendering the rejection thereto moot. Claim 11 has been rewritten into independent form and the rejection thereto is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 11 recites in pertinent part, “an interface circuit operable to connect each of the plurality of pairs of connection lines with the corresponding circuit block and disconnect the CPU from the corresponding circuit block, when the microcomputer is in a test mode.” Exemplary embodiments of the interface circuit 3536b/3537b are shown, for example, in Figure 21 of Applicants’ drawings. According to such a combination as recited in claim 11, at the time of testing, the interface circuit can enable a disconnection of the test target circuit from the system bus and a direct connection of the test target circuit with the driving means for sending a test signal output from the nonvolatile memory to the test target circuit. Accordingly, test data can be sent directly to each circuit which is to be tested. This makes it possible to conduct an elaborate testing process which can not be done through the system bus, thereby enabling the capability to obtain an improvement of the defect detection ratio as compared with the case where testing is performed through the system bus.

In direct contrast, the system of Albertsen supplies test data to the alleged test target circuit through the system bus during testing (*see* Fig. 1, bus 3). Albertsen neither discloses nor suggests directly supplying test data to the test target circuit without involving the system bus, as can be performed by using the interface circuit of the present invention. Indeed, Albertsen is completely silent as to an interface circuit as set forth in claim 11, let alone suggest the operational capabilities arising therefrom. In this regard, because Albertsen does not include such an interface circuit, the system of Albertsen can not supply test data that exceeds the data transfer capacity of the system bus to the test target circuit during testing.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently (noting that "inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities", *Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra*, 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999)), in a single prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986), based on the forgoing, it is submitted that Albertsen does not anticipate claim 11, nor any claim dependent thereon.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 11 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination. Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.


**CONCLUSION**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Ramyar M. Farid  
Registration No. 46,692

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 RMF:men  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: November 25, 2005**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**